

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Bruce L. Petersen	)	Examiner: Timothy D. Collins
	)	
Pat. App. Serial No.: 10/672,003	)	Group Art Unit: 3643
	)	
Filing Date: September 25, 2003	)	Docket No.: PET-101
	)	
Title: Hover Craft Having Co-axial Counter-Rotating . . .	)	

**RENEWED PETITION TO REVIVE UNDER 37 CFR 1.137(b)**

Mail Stop Petition  
Commissioner for Trademarks  
P. O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Applicant hereby renews his petition to revive the above referenced patent application which was filed in the United States and Trademark Office (USPTO") on April 14, 2009. That petition was rejected in a decision by the USPTO Office Petitions mailed on June 16, 2009. The Office of Petitions based its decision on applicant's failure to pay the entire fees required for revival. It calculated those fees as totalling \$1915, while applicant submitted a check in the amount of \$1815.

The Office of Petitions graciously suggested that the applicant may wish to file a request for reconsideration of that decision. This petition is intended to do just that. The \$100 difference is being submitted herewith electronically through the USPTO's EFS Web portal.

However, applicant's counsel notes that the \$100 difference between the amount paid and the amount calculated by the USPTO includes a \$50 returned check fee and \$50 additional dollars due to increases in USPTO fees over the last two years. It strikes applicants counsel as unfair that the bad acts of applicant's prior counsel, Mr. Brian Rayve, who is presently suspended from practice before the USPTO for bouncing checks to it, are still costing his victims additional funds. Had Mr. Rayve forwarded the fees that he had been advanced by the client to pay the issue fee, rather than bouncing a check to the USPTO and then hiding that fact from applicant, the additional hundred dollars in fees would've never been incurred.

In any event, those fees have been paid and the petition is now believed to be in acceptable form. Accordingly, revival of the application is respectfully requested. The

entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of the instant renewed petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137 (b) was unintentional.

Very truly yours,

**LAW OFFICES OF MARK A. HAMILL, P.C.**



Mark A. Hamill

MAH:dvk